



**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

735 SOUTH FIGUEROA STREET SUITE 2800 LOS ANGELES, CA 90017-5406 213.488.7100 F: 213.629.1033

FACSIMILETotal Pages (including cover): **6**

CENTURY CITY	Date:	January 4, 2004	Must Be Sent By:	ASAP
HOUSTON	To:	Examiner Carlos Lugo	Fax No:	(703) 746-3570 and (703) 872-9306
LONDON	Company:	U.S. Patent Office	Phone No:	(703) 305-9747
LOS ANGELES	From:	Mark R. Kendrick	Phone No:	213.488.7253
NEW YORK	User No:	14238	C/M No:	23803-250394
NORTHERN VIRGINIA	Comments:	<i>Mark R. Kendrick</i>		
ORANGE COUNTY				
SACRAMENTO				
SAN DIEGO				
SAN DIEGO-NORTH COUNTY				
SAN FRANCISCO				
SILICON VALLEY				
STAMFORD				
SYDNEY				
TOKYO				
WASHINGTON DC				

Interview Request Form PTOL-413A

Confidentiality Note:
 The documents accompanying this facsimile transmission may contain confidential information which is legally privileged. The information is intended only for the use of the individual or entity named above. If you are not the intended recipient, or the person responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of any of the information contained in this transmission is strictly PROHIBITED. If you have received this transmission in error, please immediately notify us by telephone and mail the original transmission to us. Thank you.

5 4 3 34

If you have not properly received this fax, please call (213) 488-7577. Thank you.

Operator: _____ Time Sent: _____ Batch ID: _____

20531152V1

Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form

Application No.: 09/753,013 First Named Applicant: Tan Lei
 Examiner: Carlos Lugo Art Unit: 3676 Status of Application: Pending

Tentative Participants:

(1) Mark Kendrick (2) Carlos Lugo
 (3) Tan Lei (4) _____

Proposed Date of Interview: Dec 9, 2004Proposed Time: 10:00 (AM/PM)

Type of Interview Requested:

(1) Telephonic (2) Personal (3) Video ConferenceExhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated: YES NO
 If yes, provide brief description: _____

Issues To Be Discussed

Issues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/ Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) <u>Rejection</u>	<u>All Claims</u>	<u>Opposition with 1 Answer</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(2) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(3) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(4) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
[] Continuation Sheet Attached					

Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented:

See Attached document fixed to Examiner.

An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on 12/9/04.
 NOTE: This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP § 713.01).

This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible.

Mark R. Kendrick

Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature

Examiner/SPE Signature

Mark R. Kendrick
Typed/Printed Name of Applicant or Representative48,468

Registration Number, if applicable

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.133. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 21 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.



725 SOUTH FIGUEROA STREET SUITE 2800 LOS ANGELES, CA 90017-5406 213.488.7100 F: 213.629.1033

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JAN 04 2005

FACSIMILE

Total Pages (including cover): 5

CENTURY CITY	Date:	December 8, 2004	Must Be Sent By:	ASAP
HOUSTON	To:	Examiner Carlos Lugo	Fax No:	(703) 746-3570
LONDON	Company:	U.S. Patent Office	Phone No:	(703) 305-9747
LOS ANGELES				
NEW YORK	From:	Mark R. Kendrick	Phone No:	213.488.7253
NORTHERN VIRGINIA	User No:	14238	C/M No:	23803-250394
ORANGE COUNTY	Comments:	Discussion Outline for Our Interview Tomorrow at 10:00 AM.		
SACRAMENTO				
SAN DIEGO				
SAN DIEGO-NORTH COUNTY				
SAN FRANCISCO				
SILICON VALLEY				
STAMFORD				
SYDNEY				
TOKYO				
WASHINGTON DC				

Confidentiality Note:
 The documents accompanying this facsimile transmission may contain confidential information which is legally privileged. The information is intended only for the use of the individual or entity named above. If you are not the intended recipient, or the person responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of any of the information contained in this transmission is strictly PROHIBITED. If you have received this transmission in error, please immediately notify us by telephone and mail the original transmission to us. Thank you.

PT0413A Form
10 AM
703 746-3570

11/04/05

If you have not properly received this fax, please call (213) 488-7577. Thank you.
 Operator: L Time Sent: 11:05/07 Batch ID: _____
 20528159V1

**DISCUSSION POINTS FOR EXAMINER INTERVIEW EXAMINER CARLOS
LUGO**

Application Serial No.: 09/753,093

Filing Date: January 2, 2001

Inventor: Jonathan L. Lei

Examiner Lugo,

OBJECTION TO THE DRAWINGS RESPONSE

In regard to your objection that certain limitations of the claims were not shown in any Figures, the applicant has amended Fig. 6 to include the limitations of the claim. Please verify if this would be acceptable. Support for these drawing amendments can be found in the specification at pages 4 - 5, 9, and 11 - 13. No new matter has been added.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 84, 85, 102, AND 103

In regard to the claims, the applicant submits that the disclosed references, Amazon, Ogasawara, and Mankow do not disclose, teach, or suggest the highlighted limitations of claims 84, 85, 102, and 103. Applicant understands that the Amazon reference and the Ogasawara reference disclose that users can download the software to another palm device or cellular telephone. However, these two references do not disclose that the entire software package (both the data contents and software logic) from one device are transferred from the originating device to the second palm device or cellular network.

Illustratively, suppose you have a PDA and use the PDA to store telephone numbers of contacts and you also utilize the PDA (with Amazon) to purchase a scarf on the Amazon web site. On the originating device a data file or a couple of data files would be created with these two pieces of information (phone numbers and transaction data). In the case of purchasing the scarf, the transaction data itself may be transmitted to the server of where the scarf is purchased from, but these two references (Amazon and Ogasawara) do not disclose that the software and the data are transferred to the server. Turning to the software without the data (referred to in our patent application as the transaction logic), when the software is copied from one device to the other (as you state that Amazon and Ogasawara disclose), the data would not be copied to the other device. In other words, the references do not disclose that the phone numbers and the transaction data would be transferred from one device to the other. Accordingly, the highlighted limitations of claims 84, 85, 102, and 103 distinguish over the Amazon and Ogasawara reference.

The Mankoff reference does not make up for the deficiencies of the Ogasawara reference and the Amazon reference. Although you do not specifically point to where in the Mankoff reference most of the limitations are located, the virtual coupon of the Mankoff reference is disclosed only to include a discount offer, contact information, expiration date, reminder data, retail location, a map, and a hyperlink to a provider's web site. The Mankoff reference does not disclose that the virtual coupon includes logic that 1) enables modification of the wireless transaction or that 2) enables transfer of the entire self-contained business

LOS_ANGELES_20527877v1

transaction capsule (logic and data) to other transaction participants. In the Mankoff reference, only the data (the coupon) is transferred to the other computing device, i.e., client or the server -- meaning the coupon logic or software used to interpret, modify, manipulate and interact with the coupon data need to be pre-installed by the user on his computing device beforehand. The entire business transaction capsule is not transferred to the server or client. Accordingly, the highlighted limitations of claims 84, 85, 102, and 103 distinguish over the Mankoff reference.

The limitations we are discussing above are highlighted below.

84. (New) A self-contained business transaction capsule to conduct a wireless transaction, comprising:

data regarding transaction products and transaction services;
data regarding transaction participants;
logic, in the form of executable code, enabling interaction between the transaction participants and the self-contained business transaction capsule;
logic, in the form of executable code, enabling modification of the wireless transaction; and
logic, in the form of executable code, regarding the wireless transaction and enabling transfer of the self-contained business transaction capsule from a wireless electronics device to other transaction participants.

85. (new) The self-contained business transaction capsule, according to claim 84, further including logic, in the form of executable code, enabling copying of the self-contained business transaction capsule to other transaction participants.

102. (new) A self-contained business transaction capsule to conduct a wireless transaction, comprising:

data regarding transaction products and transaction services;
data regarding transaction participants;
logic, in the form of executable code, enabling interaction between the transaction participants and the self-contained business transaction capsule;
logic, in the form of executable code, enabling modification of the wireless transaction; and

logic, in the form of executable code, regarding the wireless transaction and enabling transfer of the entire self-contained business transaction capsule from a wireless electronics device to other transaction participants.

103. (new) The self-contained business transaction capsule, according to claim 102, further including logic, in the form of executable code, enabling copying of the self-contained business transaction capsule to other transaction participants.

REJECTION OF CLAIM 87

We also respectfully disagree with the Examiner's rejection of claim 87. Specifically, in identifying each of the Amazon, the Ogasawara, and the Mankoff references, the Examiner states that any amount of users can access the [Amazon, Ogasawara, and Mankoff] web site at the same time and download the capsule and software to their palm devices in a peer-to-peer topology

between the web site and the different users. The applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner.

First, the accessing of a web site by multiple devices is **multiple client-server interactions and is not peer-to-peer communication**. Each of the Ogasawara, the Amazon, and the Mankoff references disclose the use of a client-server topology between the web site and the plurality of remote devices (PDAs, phones, computers) and do not disclose a peer-to-peer topology. Furthermore, the software that is downloaded does NOT contain peer-to-peer logic, i.e. executable code, to transmit itself to other wireless devices utilizing a peer-to-peer topology. Accordingly, the applicant submits that claim 87 further distinguishes over the Ogasawara, Amazon, and Mankoff references. Claim 87 is listed below.

87. (new) The self-contained business transaction capsule according to claim 84, further including logic, in the form of executable code, to access functionality with other wireless devices utilizing a peer-to-peer topology for transmission of the entire self-contained business transaction capsule.

In summary, all prior arts, whether Amazon, Ogasawara, Mankoff, only transmit data back and forth between pre-installed software applications on various participant devices to facilitate a transaction. Our invention, as disclosed in the patent application, is one that employs a technique that encapsulates data and logic into an executable software object that can copy ITSELF, transmit ITSELF, with all state information and transaction memory as it moves from one participant device to another.

LOS_ANGELES_20527877v1